

759.1 B25

Barker \$.60

A critical intro-
duction to American

759.1 B25

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on his card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



PUBLIC LIBRARY
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in this Pocket

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTL. SER. 80-2, 80-3

DATE DUE

[illegible]

**A CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO
AMERICAN PAINTING**

COPYRIGHT BY
WHITNEY MUSEUM OF AMERICAN ART
1931

A CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO AMERICAN PAINTING

THE europeans who colonized North America did more than bring with them some painted pictures; they brought the craft of painting. For their colonizing was a transplanting of all that they considered essential to civilization. With the english in New England this was the intention from the first, and in time it became the dominant idea in all the regions of settlement along the atlantic coast. Sooner or later the colonists everywhere realized that they could not thrive simply on their memories of a home to which they hoped to return; they had to import not merely physical possessions but also individuals skilled to make new ones as need might arise. And they required painters less for decorating those possessions or for devising the signs which were the picturesque essentials to successful shops and taverns than for recording the lineaments of community worthies for aftertimes.

Through the difficult beginning years, of course, the painters had less to do than other craftsmen. Yet as early as 1641 a governor of the colony was being limned in Boston; and by 1700 the now wellknown Anon. was at work from Massachusetts to Virginia. In New Netherland the dutch were depicted by more than a half-dozen painters of varying ability. From Sweden also came a painter; to Virginia came one, among others, whose skill verged close upon brilliancy; and Charleston's principal prerevolutionary portraitist, a painter of genuine charm, had both predecessors and contemporaries. Before 1750 every section of the country had produced some to carry on the craft and even, with Feke, to advance

it. About that time, also, less than a century and a half from the effective initiation of settlement in the coastal region, commenced the work of Copley, who raised the craft of limning into an art of portraiture which will always possess aesthetic as well as historic importance.

The true significance of this achievement can be understood only by approaching it from the other side in time. During the hundred and fifty years since Copley left this country several different techniques have been imported and discarded, and all of them have been strikingly at variance with his. Such temporary fashions and a long inadequate accumulation of facts concerning colonial conditions have given rise to an undue degree of deprecation, sometimes of depreciation, in what has been written about the tradition and equipment of the earliest portraitists. A more accurate sense of history will first direct attention to the inevitability of a lag, both in time and in quality, to all colonial cultures; and this initial emphasis will permit a fairer conception of the relative greatness of what was attained in colonial North America.

From this viewpoint the early appearance of painting here wears an air of paradox. It seems natural that the colonists should desire all that they had been accustomed to in Europe; but it also seems surprising that they should attempt to satisfy this particular desire so far from their old life and in a new life where the very existence of the community required unremitting labour from every member of it. The craftsmen available under such conditions were necessarily inferior to those who remained in Europe; but from about 1725, after society had become more stabilized, there came men who were more than respectable workmen even when judged by the current European standards. The fact of their crossing the ocean indicates an increase of prosperity in the colonies, for they came in

search of economic betterment; and the stamp of time and place which New England imprinted upon its own development of portraiture is a measure of the vigorous intellectual life which accompanied the gains in wealth and security.

This idiomatic character is naturally not to be discovered in the work of those who transplanted the craft from Europe, yet they became as thoroughly identified with this country as did those who participated in the transplantation of government or religion. Smibert became as much a part of life here as had Governor Bradford or Roger Williams a hundred years before; Bridges' pictures of the men and women of Virginia are as essential to a comprehension of the sort of society which existed there as is the narrative of Bacon's Rebellion; and colonial charlestonians were no more at home in their own city than was Theüs who depicted them. In the story of New Netherland Pieter Stuyvesant overshadows all the Duykincks, but the latter's portraits down three generations do not a little toward giving that colony its own particularity in the larger story of american beginnings. Even when the painters worked here for a time and afterward left the country, as in the case of Wollaston and probably in that of Blackburn, it is only what they did here that gives them a place in any history. Thus their americanism remains a matter of geography, and all qualitative use of that word must be reserved for those who came late enough to respond to the influences which made americans out of europeans; but all of these men, wherever born, have here alone a local habitation and a name.

The limitation of prerevolutionary painting to portraiture, like the craft itself, reached back to Europe; in this respect as in others America was originally a portion of Europe transplanted. Before the colonists began to emigrate the preference for that form of

painting was established, if not in every country at large, at least in the classes from which they came. In the broadest aspect this preference was one phase of the secularization of Northern Europe which received its most striking exemplification in religious protestantism; it accompanied that revolt as a natural expression of the revolting temperament, which was either consciously resistant or unconsciously indifferent to all the arts that had so well served a religion of ceremonious pomp. Consequently the taste for portraiture, though a very minor factor in the complex whole of colonial America, was yet one bond of likeness between the dutch, the swedes, the french, the germans, and the english who peopled the region which later became the United States of America.

Among the english, who were to form the dominant political and cultural element in that region, the very idea of religious art had died. The stripping of the shrines by the iconoclasts had been largely accomplished before colonization was begun; so that even the emigrants to Virginia, who maintained the forms and doctrines of the established church, did not trouble to adorn the bareness of their buildings with art. The altarpainting of *The Last Supper* executed in 1720 and 1721 by Gustavus Hesselius on commission for the church of St. Barnabus in Maryland remains apparently the single instance in the english colonies where picturemaking served religion. The colonists of New England, pilgrim and puritan alike, contemptuously refused all "popish" trappings for their meeting-houses; these structures, originally in continuous use as courthouse, townhall, and church, stood appropriately secular in their austerity of form and poverty of decoration. Both the indifference of the southern english and the opposition of the northern english in the new world were natural continuations of the attitudes which prevailed among their own kind in the old; for in England itself, ever

since the close of the fifteenth century, when the Wars of the Roses did so much toward extirpating mediaeval religious craftsmanship in general, painting had been confined to portraiture.

Not only that, but the portraits which were produced there can be termed english only in the sense that those by Theüs and Blackburn are called american. Most of them were actually made by the foreigners who came and went in dozens, and even when made by men of english birth they were entirely continental in technical habit. The two or three englishmen before 1700 who approached greatness were portrait miniaturists; and that branch of painting has throughout its history shown itself less susceptible than other branches to specifically national modifications and more nearly uniform in character wherever practised. For more than two hundred years the english entertained a numerous company of portraitists from every nation of Europe—Germany, Sweden, Holland, Flanders, France, and Italy; and from 1600 until the establishment of painting in America the technic of all the work done in England was the internationalized baroque-rococo which then prevailed wherever royal courts could make it fashionable.

The style of painting indicated by that compound of two words which are oftentimes indiscriminately applied to the same thing can be more clearly discussed by defining those words to designate different grades of achievement within the general manner. Such a definition would ignore all narrowly geographical connotations and run the distinguishing line between largeness and smallness of structure and rendering. Thus Tiepolo would be ranked as qualitatively baroque, but Boucher would be considered rococo; and among the french sculptors of the preceding century the same distinction could be drawn between Puget and Girardon. In this way the difference would clearly be not one of kind or of locality or of

period, but one of degree; its ultimate reference would be to the intrinsic paltriness or amplitude of the mind which happened to be expressing itself thus.

In the sense here suggested Rubens and Van Dyck were baroque, while Lely and Kneller were rococo; and from the year 1641, when Van Dyck died and Lely came to England, there elapsed almost a century of gradual decline in painting before the brilliant beginning of a genuinely english school in the person of Hogarth. The florid stylism imported from the continent dominated to such an extent that even Cromwell and his favourite daughter, when they came to have their portraits painted, went to Lely for them; and the daughter now seems to have undergone some sort of tailoring process which left her looking remarkably like a Hampton-Court beauty. But the anecdote related of Cromwell himself, that he ordered the painter to put in his warts, may serve as an extreme instance of a tendency to naturalism with which England and Northern Europe generally modified a style derived from Italy. Yet in England this tendency never played a determining part in painting before Hogarth; it remains at best an occasionally piquant flavour in a monotonous succession of stylistic *soufflés* by foreign pastry cooks.

Therefore the painting which was transplanted to America from England itself was not merely restricted to portraiture but was in conception and in technic a rococo continental recipe. The formula is plainly visible in work as early as that ascribed to Jeremiah Dummer and in the slightly later pastels of Henrietta Johnston. This is what Pelham learned in making his mezzotints after Kneller and others; this is what Smibert learned in studying under Sir James Thornhill and in visiting Italy for three years before he came to New England. This is what Feke learned partly from him, but

more effectively and earlier from Gustavus Hesselius, only to improve it; this is the formula into which Bridges and Wollaston fitted the personages of the south.

This it is, moreover, which reached this country more directly from the continent of Europe. Strijcker and Cousturier in New Netherland form an exception to this because their richer impasto and their slightly more dramatic use of contrasting lights and darks derive straight from the strongly localized technic of Holland; but the first of the Duijkincks passed on to his descendants a manner which was both more facile and more shallow in the degree of its approach to the current international fashion. A still more notable exception is the true primitive who limned Mrs. Freake and her baby so beautifully; apparently he learned his craft in New Netherland and went about New England during the last quarter of the seventeenth century. But the mass of anonymous work, north and south, is clearly by variously incompetent practitioners of the rococo technic of Europe. Gustavus Hesselius brought over a dullish version of it and his son John continued it; perhaps from the former Claypoole learned it. West practised it in clumsy fashion before he went to Italy. Thence also, and from the same teachers, Benbridge later imported a fresh strain of the continental habit; and when he took it to Charleston he found it already there in the more capable hands of Theüs.

The localized american transplantations of the internationalized european practice were never fused into a powerful and lasting technical tradition simply because during their term of activity intercommunication between the colonies was insufficient. But all of the colonial variants, with that of New Netherland making a partial exception, had sufficient characteristics in common from the european sources to bring about a perceptible measure of uni-

formity. There is a prevailing hardness of effect which is caused both by the tendency toward the texture of enamel and by the rigidly emphatic draughtsmanship; even where time and mistreatment have impaired the former trait, the latter remains to show how widespread was the reliance upon recipe and how rare was any personal sensitiveness to naturalistic nuance. The glitter of highlights and the sheen of stuffs, stiff poses and repetitive hands, make up a world of elegance and dignity which owes more to routine studio training than to individual study of appearances. And the larger the canvas the plainer becomes the evidence of a common ideal of portraiture; the greater number of details in costume and accessories and background combine into the restlessness of true rococo pattern.

In one other respect prerevolutionary portraiture in America exhibits an even more complete uniformity: the men and women portrayed in it are consistent in type. Quite as definitely as architecture or silverware, and perhaps more engagingly, the painting of the age belongs to a separate class. This class may be called, in relation to the other and equally differentiated groups of that period, an aristocracy; but if that word is used, it must be understood in a sense peculiar to the time and place. It was not an aristocracy in the contemporaneous european sense; although it was based upon the possession of land and wealth and the power which accompanies these, the possession of them was not a matter of long heredity but one of recent acquisition by people who were, in their european origins, almost entirely middleclass. Their dominance in the new world, made easier in the absence of pressure from above by any preëxistent privileged class, was the result of personal energy and ability. Whether they ruled great plantations in the Carolinas or acquired immense domains in New Netherland, whether

they developed trade in Philadelphia or enlarged the seagoing commerce of Newport, they displayed a forcefulness and a strength of mind that are written large over the canvases on which they still so vividly exist.

Though in personal character and in social origin the southerner and the northerner were akin, and though for both the family portrait had the same symbolical value, they had quite different attitudes toward those who made the portraits. The affiliations of the southern aristocracy with England were much closer than those of any other group of colonists in America: their governmental control was more effective, their trade relations were direct and continuous, their dependence in religious and educational affairs was more complete. Of equal importance was the fact that their cultural and social relations were with the english court and minor aristocracy; even where the planter rose from the rank of bourgeois or adventurer, his class position in the south sooner or later permitted such contacts in England. The structure of society fostered a certain richness and geniality of living at the top, with an accompanying luxury of possessions and dignity of settings; but always the tone of that living was caught from England, and thence also its material adornments were, whenever possible, brought. In Virginia especially the feeling was that a real portrait could be painted only in London, even if it had to be done from a written description sent over in place of the person. The itinerant limner found frequent employment, but his work was regarded, particularly by later generations, as intrinsically less desirable. So it came about that, next to the english-made brick, the english-painted portrait is a prime virginian tradition; and the first strongly localized idiom in painting occurred in a newer England than Virginia's ruling class wanted it to be.

The initial advantage of the northern colonists, especially those who came between 1730 and 1740, was their own clear conception of what they were doing. They were consciously making something different—not a tradingpost like New Netherland, not a colony like Virginia, but a new home. They were in spirit religiously separatist; they came with a measure of political independence elsewhere unknown; and circumstances rapidly attenuated their economic ties with England to a unique degree. Further, they brought with them a community idea which fostered the growth of towns and their ways of making a living permitted a greater density of population. Thus to an appreciable extent conditions there were favourable to the quick formation of an independent mind and to the possibility of an independent cultural expression of that mind.

Not even the original puritans were hostile to so pragmatic an art as portraiture. The relatively few instances in which private scruples were voiced against it have been exaggerated into a misinterpretation of an entire age. And when, after 1660, the severity of clerical domination began to subside before the increasing power of landed and mercantile wealth, the way was laid open for a rapid development in all the crafts which could perform definite functions in the community life. For a new people who desired to make visible their rise in life, portraiture was, in the eighteenth century, as serviceable as housebuilding or silversmithing; the founding fathers of this nation were preceded by the founding fathers of families who required effigies equally with furniture as a means of consolidating and maintaining their social position. What they wanted done for them had to be done by living men, and they were content to have it done by the men immediately available—in painting as in architecture and the crafts. This saved them from the negative role of mere acquisition of pictures by dead worthies

and enabled them to participate in a genuinely creative activity. In response to their increasing patronage came better craftsmen, and presently was born to them an inheritor of the craft whose quality of mind both expressed their particular character and stamped them with its own.

The fineness of Copley's achievement is due to what may be called his experiencing nature. This means that he had, first, an ability to learn from the teachings and the works of others; but more importantly it also means that he had an added ability to look directly at nature and to remould his acquired technic to suit his own fresh vision.

Not only can no mind extract experience from a vacuum, but any mind's achievement is to a considerable extent dependent upon the quality of what exists in the external world ready for its use. The degree to which conditions for acquiring the craft of portraiture had improved in this country may be realized by comparing any fine Copley dating from 1774 or thereabouts with the *Mrs. Freake and Baby Mary*, which was done almost one hundred years before. Copley and his predecessor exhibit the same sort of mind—one that takes tenacious hold upon things and personalities; and so far as may be gauged from very different results, it may even be said that the two painters' mental capacities were pretty nearly equal; so that the difference in these results comes mainly from the differing degrees of opportunity for professional training. With the urgency of all great natures, Copley keenly felt the limitations of what was available to him in his formative years; but in his old age, after he had altered his technic in mistaken emulation of his british contemporaries and thus effected his own artistic disintegration, he repeatedly affirmed that his best work had been done in America.

His earliest work here shows that he started from the average technical level of the time, that he drew and painted with only apprentice skill in the manner of Pelham and Smibert. In rapid assimilation of all that was accessible to him, he began to exhibit a genuine painter's love of rendering the textures of rich garments and draperies. The influence at this stage seems to be that of Feke; and this is appropriate because Feke's advance upon what he had learned from the elder Hesselius and from Smibert consisted less in any interpretation of character or any improvement of design than in the manipulation of pigment for its own sake with a strong element of sensuous delight in doing so.

But the determining influence just preceding Copley's own technical maturity was that of Blackburn. He is the most capable of all the prerevolutionary painters from abroad; and perhaps the main reason why so good a craftsman came here at all was that, during the seventeen-forties, the fashion in England was already turning to a manner of portraiture different from his. For he, more than any other painter of the period, more plainly than even Bridges, is a practitioner of the internationalized technic which then, in England, was being supplanted by the different stylism of the true english portrait school. It is at least possible that all of Blackburn's professional training was acquired in England; yet his way of applying pigment and his dainty (even where inaccurate) drawing are so plainly continental that it seems reasonable to infer some direct contact with Paris. In any event, the thing of fundamental importance concerning Blackburn's work, and also concerning the work by the other foreign born who first transplanted painting to this country, is not a matter of conjecture: all of it is, in accordance with the differentiation previously suggested, qualitatively rococo.

Out of what he could learn from that work Copley, by the force and loftiness of his own mind, made an art qualitatively baroque. This difference of quality, shown in the conceptual power of the whole and in the rendering of the separate items, is often the most convincing evidence that a given portrait is by Copley rather than by Blackburn; Copley's amplitude of feeling, even in such a detail as a nostril or an eyelid, is distinct from Blackburn's smallmindedness, which attains at best only a miniaturelike precision. Even where Copley copied accessories or adapted settings from prints after the contemporaneous fashionables in London, his severity of drawing and his hardness of textures kept his work consistently in the continental tradition of previous generations. He is part of the new world's vigorous affirmation of its continuity with and difference from the old.

The continuity consists mainly in the craft; the difference consists in the degree to which visual realism is pushed beyond the European habit. This quality now and then flashes out from the technical dregs of Joseph Badger; it is steadier in the coarse workmanship of Pieter Vanderlyn; it attains somewhat more subtlety in a portrait or two by Winthrop Chandler and real distinction in the few that were done by Ralph Earl before he went to England. Occasionally, but not as often as at a later date, an anonymous portraitist, wrestling Jacob-like with his vision, is not wholly defeated. And in the work of Copley, almost from his beginnings until after he left this country, a resolute and unflinching honesty is the intellectually definitive element that permeates its increasing technical virtuosity; the clear dominance of this realistic probity through all the harsh splendor of his stateliest settings makes him uniquely great.

But Copley could not have thus strongly impressed this trait

upon his patrons unless it also expressed their own natures. Their origins in Europe, their experiences in America, the material substantiality of their success, all forwarded their mastery over the things of this world. Cotton Mather has recorded how a minister was exhorting a congregation in northeastern Massachusetts to continue in godliness and so maintain the original aim of the colonists, "whereupon a well-known person, there in the assembly, cried, Sir, you are mistaken, you think you are preaching to the people of the Bay; our main end was to catch fish." Even the Bay people's efforts were directed toward things quite as tangible as fish from the sea; and he who best painted them so far shared and transmuted this characteristic that he caught the appearance and the mental idiosyncrasy of an age.

This measure of sympathy between himself and his time enabled him to paint without the handicap of antagonism, without its weakening consequence of selfconsciousness, and with the immense advantage of complete objectivity. The technic he practised and the taste he satisfied vanished with the class for which he worked; there was a break in the art of painting which was the direct result of a break in the national life itself. Yet the authentic strain of realism which marks the first manifestation of the american mind in painting persisted in that art, as in life, and recurred in fresh forms.

NEITHER the political break of the War for Independence nor the economic break of the War of 1812, important as they both were, required or produced a corresponding cleavage in the cultural relationships between England and the United States. The real break in the life of the new nation, which was not to make itself visible in painting until after it had altered politics, was caused by the rapid extension of the frontier; its formation had com-

menced before the revolution and its fruition was to be a mind more different from the mind of the colonial aristocrat than that had been from the european mind. In the meanwhile, it was to the survivors of the prerevolutionary aristocracy that the possibility of patronizing the painters was confined. Despite their dwindling influence in the nation at large, they continued an active support of a new generation of portraitists, who stylized them into a uniform ruddiness caught from the sunset glow of the british eighteenth-century school.

In their more ambitious portraits the members of that school continued the habits of design which had been practised by the foreigners who had immediately preceded them in England; and scarcely more often than those predecessors did they rise from ro-coco triviality into a largeness and vigour truly baroque. But in the almost equally important technical matters of brushwork, impasto, and colour-schemes they developed a complex set of differences sufficient to give them a specific character in the history of painting. Although in their backgrounds and accessories they retained an air of stage sets, usually quite thin in effect, in their figures they attained a greater substantiality of rendering; they also softened and varied their pigment textures generally. They applied their paint more freely and juicily; they drew, if not much more accurately, yet much less rigidly; and they exhibited a decided liking for the pervasiveness of warm colours.

That these technical modifications were not transplanted immediately and in a body to this country was only another instance of the inevitable developmental delay in all colonial cultures. Yet the eventual importation of them was equally inevitable, and this would have been accomplished even more rapidly than it was except for the interruption of the revolutionary war.

Pratt and Delanoy, the earliest-returning pupils of West, did not, during their student days, fully assimilate the methods used in other studios than their teacher's; but the few portraits done by them after their return which can at present be identified constitute, in their richer pigment surface and suaver drawing, a transitional group between the hard and awkward literalness of average colonial effort and the obvious facility of republican practice. Almost the entire extent of the changes involved in this radical alteration of fashion may be realized in contrasting early and late examples by Charles Willson Peale; but one of his limitations was that he never satisfactorily managed the emphatic yet suffused reds fancied by those practitioners who most nearly equalled him in quantity production. This further change, along with an even clearer personal deterioration from an earlier probity of draughtsmanship, is to be discerned in the portraits which Ralph Earl painted after he came back from England.

The characteristic in which all of these painters—and the fact that they were all below the highest level of attainment only emphasizes their significance in this respect—exhibited a difference from their exemplars across the ocean is the omission from their work of the artificial elegance which was so prominent a trait of british eighteenth-century portraiture. The tendency to a complete naturalism initiated by Hogarth was thwarted by the studio stylism of Reynolds and the rest; yet their stylism was, in its very artificiality, appropriate to the age and class they rendered. The manners and tastes of the wealthy aristocrats in Great Britain were pervaded by a degree of ostentation which was not adequately paralleled even by the wealthiest on this side of the ocean; and among the latter those who purchased portraits, unable to emulate the former in the conditions of living, did not ask in portraiture what they had

not in life. If any strong desire for that sort of irreality had existed here, it could have found scope only on the scale of full-length life-size renderings, and these were infrequent in the total number of portraits painted during the early years of the republic. The main reason for this was, quite simply, the straitened finances of the american aristocrats; but even on the smaller scale of the prevalent kitcat portrait there was a prosaicism of preference positive enough to be a genuine expression of character. The englishman Pine, bringing to Philadelphia a fairly complete approximation to Reynolds' technic, persuaded a few of his female subjects into being portraitized in romantically unreal costumes; but this innovation scarcely met with the success, not to say notoriety, of his cast of the Venus de' Medici. Certainly none of the native painters who first practised the british technic made any serious attempt to infect their fellow-countrymen with a fondness for the british pageantry of content.

What in them may have been a more or less unconscious registration of a taste they shared was in Gilbert Stuart an exercise of choice. It would not be accurate to say that he was technically unequal to the scale and elaboration of typically british work, for he executed a few such portraits in which the treatment of the accessories is thoroughly adequate in a proper proportion of emphasis to the sitters' personalities. He could paint clothes and still-life well enough when he wanted to; but as a rule he did not want to, because his interest as a painter was overwhelmingly in human character. This is a matter of record in sayings that remain both from his period of pupilage in London and from his period of oldmastership in Boston; it was a consciously motivated step toward naturalism of content even as his peculiarly personal technic was an intentional differentiation from both that of his american prede-

cessors and that of his british contemporaries. This developed craftsmanship involved a use of the brush which, in its minute strokes and its broken pigment, anticipated the manual habit of the impressionists; and it enabled him to secure a colour-drenched light in which every detail of expressive modelling plays its due part in the revelation of some specific individual.

By the time that Stuart returned in 1793 he was, in the fullest meaning of the word, a master; and the union in him of mental and technical superiority resulted in nothing less than the transformation of american portraiture. His skill of hand remained essentially untransmissible, but from him his followers at least caught some conception of a naturalistic envelope of air and some idea of painting as distinguished from the application of colour over a drawing. Unavoidably, however, his variety of handling became in them an indiscriminate repetitiousness, for their minds moved on a level much below that to which he raised every person who sufficiently stirred his human curiosity. Every such sitter, if not by position an aristocrat, was turned into one on Stuart's canvas; whereas almost all of those who sat to Stuart's followers remained on canvas what they really were—dullish worthies in the process of subsiding into a drab uniformity of aspect.

Routine portrait practice, mediocre in itself, was now much better than before the revolution; but the great mass of it, in its undifferentiating facility, makes it only too plain that it is not sufficient for an art to be merely of its time. If it is to remain intrinsically significant for later generations, it must contain more than the spirit of an age; it must manifest a harmoniously blended element of difference caught from the personality of the artist. Stuart, like Copley before him, impressed this personal distinction upon his mature achievements; but the works of his followers are for the

most part too thoroughly infected by the spreading commonplaceness of the new american art patrons for them to retain any value beyond that of a reasonably satisfactory record.

Also as records only must the immense majority of nineteenth-century miniatures be regarded. The popularity of the medium with the buying public resulted in a striking development of technical skill; but here, just as in England and Europe at that time and before, it received no stamp from its makers more profound than dexterity of execution and no impress from its purchasers more forcible than the current fashions of costume.

A few portraitists with parisian training practised a precision of draughtsmanship and a purity of colour that won small approval from a public which was already welcoming the drooping gracilities of Sully—ringleted damsels quite too unsullied by the world. This painter's craft itself was more than respectable even in its fluency, and with it he attained a number of canvases distinguished by a robust romanticism; but too large a proportion of his prolific production was a visual counterpart to the mellifluous tinkle of the contemporaneous album verses. Poems and pictures alike turned aside from life and submitted to the incarceration of genteelness.

Yet genteelness itself was the expression of a collective aspiration toward culture; and its defect of unreality simply meant that those who embodied it were too recently and too rapidly arrived at affluence. In this respect the americans of the eastern commercial cities were almost indistinguishable from the english and the europeans who had preceded them into the sudden riches of industrialism; and as a newer people in a land which had been from the first a colony, they showed a natural deference to those who had the seeming advantage of living close to the sources of art. The americans did not perceive, and they could not fairly have been expected

to perceive, that those who did live there had themselves no capacity for great or profound art. What happened throughout the occident, after the coming of the machine, was not so much a deterioration in taste on the part of those who once possessed it as it was a rise to dominance in art patronage of a new people who had never had it.

In consequence, all the misdirected efforts of wouldbe artists in nineteenth-century America, from the tragic failures of the english-trained history-painters at the beginning to the successful failures of the french-trained fashionables at the end, cannot be unreservedly censured. If any blame is to be distributed at this late day, the major part of it must be apportioned to the europeans who, in a complete misunderstanding of their own inheritance of painting, preferred shallow virtuosity to intellectual depth and trivial anecdote to emotional intensity. The mistake of the americans was the natural one of going to school to the living european painters rather than to the dead ones; and their efforts consisted of successive attempts, less and less belated as the years passed by and the pace of living itself became faster, to import the rapidly changing technical fashions of Europe.

Nor were these efforts a total loss, for the two continents had too much in common for the painting languages of the one to fail the other entirely. Applied to american subject-matter in the fields of history, genre, and portraiture—all of these, be it noted, offering material predominantly factual—the technics of London, Düsseldorf, Munich, and Paris did manage to record the interests of the age. A school of landscape painting rose to eventual greatness on a wave of genuine popularity; but, aside from landscape, the presentday search for reality in art is being directed to what were then its comparatively unregarded manifestations.

The sort of reality now valued is not to be discovered in the peculiar composite then called the historical style—the outstanding trait of which was unhistoricalness. Its extreme artificiality can be made plain only by stressing how revolutionizing was the effect upon both british and continental practice of West's quite prosaic innovation, adhered to in the face of strongly expressed advance disapproval by the most influential aesthetic dogmatists, of introducing naturalistic costumes into his *Death of Wolfe*. And even this was only a halfway measure, since no amount of such literalism of detail could obviate the necessity for arrangements which never quite escaped the effect of staged scenes. A further anomaly was the fact that the greater number of these "ten-acre canvases" were not depictions of actual events, whether near or distant in time, but concocted allegories and mythologies appealing to the nobler emotions of polite society.

Such magniloquent conceptions, usually quite dull in execution, were offered to their fellow-citizens by home-returned pupils of West who dreamed of an immortality that would almost match their master's. In London they had failed to note how no english practitioner of the grand style could make a living by it and they had not realized how West's own success with it was an accident of personal friendship with a king not yet legally insane. They attempted to call forth a popular response to something which had no relevance to american life, and their failure has some significance for a correct estimate of the time. Not a great deal of praise can be given to what was, after all, mere indifference following a spasm of curiosity; but the quickness and the completeness with which the one succeeded the other might be interpreted as an act of realistic common sense.

The less imaginative branch of the grand style received a more

admirable expression in Trumbull's brilliant preparatory studies for his pictorial history of the revolution; but these works and the long succession of technical mediocrities and incompetencies, which attained a sort of apotheosis in that immense artistic mistake by which Leutze made himself american forever, raise the problem of patrioteering.

The call for cultural differences produced to order had been intermittently sounded before the revolution; and after that event there was a chorus of voices, both native and foreign, summoning this nation to create a new literature and a new art to match the newly operative political and social ideals. Something of this was to be expected of a country young enough to be selfconscious; but that europeans should join in such exhortations was evidence less of their preservation of historical perspective than of the strong hold which America already had upon their imaginations.

It still needs saying that patriotism can never of itself cause artistic greatness, as several european countries politically younger than the United States are just now discovering afresh. That motive may be present in the individual artist as a part of the complex process of getting sufficiently excited to create art; but where the process of creation continues to fine issues, it is necessarily subordinated to more important factors. Where it becomes so dominant that it brings about a desire to be different at all costs, it results in a constraint and an awkwardness which make great art inachiev-able. As a phase of national adolescence it may be regarded with a certain indulgence whenever—but not until—maturity has eliminated the possibility of its recurrence.

Considerably less involved in this national selfconsciousness was the novelty of genre painting, the main merit of which was a deep and unforced pleasure in homely incidents and familiar scenes.

Technically it was on a somewhat higher level than the average of the history-pictures, for its makers were less concerned with histrionics and more intent upon painting well according to their lights; but in its most widely popular manifestations its subject-matter was conditioned to the point of visual falsification by the omnipresent genteelness of the contemporaneous mind. In the worst examples there is a scoured and polished illusionism that traces ultimately to their purchasers' mental laziness and desire for emotional comfort; but such practitioners as Mount and Eastman Johnson found techniques which matched their unaffected sentiment in honesty. Although the human situation in paint shades over imperceptibly into unpainterlike anecdotage, the anecdote by itself is not the aesthetic vice it has been so often called in recent years; what gave this branch of painting a bad name was less its content than the mistaken handling to which that content was subjected. True painters like Homer and Eakins could use the story-telling element without compromising the integrity of their vision and could raise genre into permanent aesthetic expressiveness.

Now and then this degree of significance was also attained by some painter away from the commercial centres where supposedly sophisticated patrons were buying the latest pictorial importations or the current native imitations of them. The extent and importance of this folk-art has yet to be generally recognized, for it is still in process of being discovered. Although the greater part of it appears to consist of portraiture, and although to this branch almost entirely do the examples of high aesthetic worth appear to be confined, this genuinely popular expression spread into every form of painting. Landscape, genre, still-life—this particularly in the fruit-pieces and flower-arrangements so dear to female seminaries—are all extensively represented; many hundreds of pictures were made

of the clipper ships; and a further manifestation both remarkable and hardly to be expected took the form of house-decoration. The greater part, though by no means all, of this work is still anonymous; but, be its makers named or unknown, it remains unfailingly amateur in quality.

This defining word need not carry any connotation of contempt; nor does it mean that the work to which it is applied must always be clumsy in execution—although it often is. What it does imply is the absence of professional sophistication in the craft, a negative trait which can be almost a virtue in itself if it is joined with freshness and directness of vision. The most admirable phase of this folk-art, when it is good at all, is precisely that it shows a real capacity for artistic vision seeking, through whatever difficulties, its fit technic; it is never a studio recipe warping or dulling or obliterating individuality of perception.

Impairment of talent in these ways is so widespread in a time as unavoidably sophisticated as the present that this age is in real danger of overvaluing that naivety which is foreign to its nature. It is inclined to attach too much importance to the quaint, forgetting that to use the word is in effect to admit that what is so described is really unimportant. And quaint the greater part of the folk-art of mid-nineteenth century America will always remain; only exceptional examples possess that plastic quality by which alone the human mind can put on canvas the spiritual meaning of its life experience.

The beginnings of american landscape evidence the same sort of vision as that shown in the average folk-art of the time. It was a vision with no trace of plastic perceptiveness, but one which rather insisted upon a hard literalism of detail. Whereas the very technical incapacity of the folk-artist frequently made him render appear-

ances more simply and broadly than he wanted to, the landscapists were from the first equipped with a plodding precision of procedure that gave their work a dry neatness of aspect which, false though it was to the physical operation of the human eye, was yet faithful to the medium which had first roused their interest in nature itself.

That medium was engraving. Not only was the very idea of making pictures from nature suggested by such reproductions but some of the most influential of the landscapists had themselves practised the reproductive craft before they began to paint. In the absence of notable originals by which to school themselves into the real painter's way of looking, their vision was qualitatively determined by the only available substitute.

Accordingly, while they thought they were teaching themselves to paint directly from nature, they were actually making pictures which seemed intended to be turned back into the other medium; and all of the earliest landscapes exhibited a succession of minute and uniformly emphatic details. The worst of them now reveal an evasion of truth in their incompetent drawing, a cheapness of sentiment in their raw colours, a littleness of mind in their fussy compositions; and the best of them only record things bit by bit, with never a glimpse of how a scene may be unified by a glance.

But the perceptions of the public had also been conditioned by the same means in the same way, so that what the painter painted the layman understood. This element of common vision played an important part in the rapid success of the new form, which thus first tapped a stream of interest powerful and continuing enough to take it far along its way to eventual greatness.

This occurrence in painting was one embodiment of a more genial and mature attitude on the part of the american mind to-

ward nature. There was a change from regarding nature as an enemy with which to battle to looking upon it as a companion or even, on occasion, a manifestation of life which deserved to be revered. The poets had voiced such sentiments before the painters did, and for a time the latter mistakenly thought that the sentiments themselves were so inherently literary that they required the trappings of narrative and allegory. But the landscapists soon realized that nature need not be tricked out with moralistic tales, that to transcribe appearances as faithfully as they could would be, for them, emotionally adequate.

Perhaps the most noteworthy fact about this entire process of mental readjustment is that, in the America of that day, it could take place only in the east. Only there had nature been sufficiently subdued and human society become sufficiently secure for a few men to pause from labour and contemplate the landscape—and, in that contemplation, to recreate the “pathetic fallacy” of art. This the pioneer could not do. His experience and his mentality united to prevent him from any lofty attainment in painting.

Those who had emigrated from the east had not taken with them the degree of civilization which had been brought across by the original colonists. The land trip was actually more difficult than the ocean voyage, and required the completest possible self-stripping of physical possessions. Every push into the west was a process of denudation; so that, once there, the tools, the houses, the habits, the minds of the settlers owed far more to the primitiveness of their immediate environment than to any memories or hopes of culture as that was understood in the older regions of the United States. A generation or two of such living involved a spiritual severance so profound and extensive that later, when these madeover americans swept back upon the east in search of all their forbears

had left behind, their incapacity for aesthetic discrimination allowed them to patronize various sorts of painting which afforded them personal satisfaction only at the sacrifice of more important qualities.

The pioneers in person could not rise to the sort of nature-love which issues into landscape art, but their descendants, embodying the frontier mind, were quick to seize upon that art as an outlet for their own emotions. Unable, or perhaps just not caring, to acquire the craft overnight, they quite naturally exulted in the panoramas which depicted a still newer and more distant west. They marvelled at a technic which covered an acre of canvas inch by inch so that the closest-peering eye could see how nature was all there, to the last unmoving and immovable leaf. These immensities of scene-painting show what their age became most excited about, but they contain few traces of the excitement itself. Too large ever to receive the toleration of being considered quaint, occasional examples are preserved from tediousness by brilliantly mistaken execution.

Their combination of a trivial realism with a grandiloquent assertiveness excellently suited a time which never became aware of the real meaning of either trait. Such literalism of detail is the unconscious handicap of those who are illiterate in the language of design; and such a treatment of nature is essentially a piece of exploitation as ruthless as what was done by the gold-miners, the timber-cutters, and the buffalo-hunters.

Clearly enough, the bombastic spirit developed from one phase of the original american work in landscape; but by adopting the technic of Düsseldorf and then infusing that with something of Turner's colour-sense, it devised for itself a vehicle better suited to its purposes. A less tangential development out of the earlier group was that which drew a large proportion of its subjects from the re-

gion of the Hudson River and the White Mountains and which, in the matter of technic, was content with a more gradual modification of the accustomed manner.

This process, though slow, was in that way surer in its technical gains and sounder in its aesthetic aim. In basic motive no great alteration occurred; so far as intention goes, there is no difference in kind between a lake scene by Doughty and a mountain scene by Wyant. The difference of quality is very great, of course; but what has happened is that the later man has entered into a pictorial inheritance which did not exist for his predecessor and he has thereby been enabled to do what the primitive of that way only dreamed of doing.

The expressive traits of this group are diametrically opposed to those of the panoramists—brushwork loose and true as against brushwork tight and accurate; low-keyed charms of tonalism as against the glare of no tone whatever; visual unity through atmospheric treatment as against a mechanical balancing of parts; all of the one set of traits joined upon canvases calculated for intimacy as against the other set spread wide on areas that could only be notorious.

From out this further development of the true landscape idea emerged at least two painters of modest but authentic greatness—Martin and Inness. In their hands the framed scene from nature was transmuted from a piece of furniture into something with life, from a thing to be looked at into a thing to be contemplated, from what satisfied the curiosity into what roused the spirit; and they themselves rose from description into communication, from craftsmanship into artistry.

But in their aesthetic advances these men and their fellows did not carry with them the sympathetic vision of the majority of the

americans who professed an interest in the art. They worked apart and under difficulties which were sometimes bitter in their intensity, while the mass of painting, along with literature and architecture, participated in the era's booming confusion which still reverberates down the years.

For then even genteelness had broken down and a generation of the openly vulgar was calling the tune of such art as was bought. To the original pioneer painting and most other art was actually superfluous and therefore he got along without it; to his descendants, newly come to riches that demanded public attestation, art became necessary precisely because it was a superfluity and could so serve as an evidence of social status. Accordingly, the contortions of the oriental nook and the knick-knacks on the whatnot were matched by the gleaming knobs and curlicues of monstrous gilt picture-frames. Painting itself was one of two things: what was copied by good little girls in boardingschool or what was admired by bold, bad men in barrooms.

In such circumstances it was inevitable that the greatest painting of the time would be accomplished in the greatest degree of isolation: which is not at all the same thing as saying that misunderstanding and solitude are what make great artists. If the individual artist finds solitude necessary to his creativeness, well and good; but no artist, however solitary by nature, ever asks for misunderstanding. Rather is he always hoping for comprehension; that, indeed, is a part—and in this country it has frequently proved to be the most tragic part—of the business of being an artist. And in hoping for understanding the artist means something more than appreciation on the part of a few exceptional individuals; he means nothing less than the opportunity to function as a member of the community through its need and use of him.

Hunt would have been a finer artist and New England would now be better off if it had given him more to do than painting a few portraits and teaching a few lady art students; that much is proved by his magnificent response to his one fine opportunity. It was a better state of affairs in which those who commissioned the buildings permitted the architects to enlist the grave and noble, though often feeble, skill of LaFarge.

Fuller's quiet talent flowered beautifully in a solitude which he, as an artist, neither sought nor shunned; Homer hunted down his loneliness with an almost savage intensity, even as Ryder guarded his by a delicate evasiveness of other claims. But all three of these solitaries were seeking the visual expression of experience in the capacity of exploring tentacles of a consciousness greater than themselves. How many of their contemporaries knew it?

As for Eakins, he appears to have been of such an iron constitution, morally speaking, that it might be beside the point to wish more acclaim for him alive. The lack of recognition seems not to have seriously impaired his unflinching utterance of truth; perhaps having it might not have appreciably increased his production or enhanced its quality. But certainly his community would have shown itself more worthy of admiration if, when confronted by an art so uncompromising, it had risen "to the height of this great argument."

For Eakins' lofty realistic probity more and more convincingly reveals itself as one of the twin peaks in painting of the American mind. And the other peak is formed by the epic imaginative authenticity of Ryder.

The contrast often drawn between the two men's work may be as misleading as it appears obvious. How could Eakins have so veraciously conveyed the objective aspects of *his* world except by

imaginative power? How could Ryder have added his realm of imagination to our experience except by a realistic mastery of *his* world? Eakins' integrity of mind: Ryder's incorruptibility of soul —there lies the granite base of identity between the peaks which seem so distant from each other.

THE conditions in this country which isolated the best painters at work during the third quarter of the nineteenth century were greatly intensified by the aftermath of the Civil War; and the young men who wished to become painters found themselves experiencing a double pull toward Europe. Naturally enough would they wish to go there in search of technical training; almost every american-born individual whom they would recognize as a painter had done so before them. But the appalling disruption of the national life following upon the war left them with so strong a sense of uncertainty, to use the mildest word possible, that Europe looked like the only source of spiritual restoration.

The nature of their ambition itself rendered them a select group; and this in turn gave an added importance to whatever they might do with their lives. They departed to Europe almost in a body and, after the customary years of study, the conflict of decisions over whether to remain abroad or to return home resulted in every possible variation of the problem of the expatriate. It was, in fact, exactly the unprecedented numbers then involved in it that elevated it temporarily to prime importance; for by 1875 it had had a hundred years of recurrent existence.

That particular group of students had been preceded by Whistler, who was already successfully rationalizing his temperament into a philosophy of cosmopolitanism. Others besides Whistler were doing the same thing, of course; and to art students fresh

from an America in confusion such ideas appeared to be a credible gospel.

The period of pupilage passed, a good many of them proposed to live out that gospel in Europe. They made their choice, individualists in an era of individualism; and doubtless most of them secured their share of individual rewards. In their feelings and acts they were a fitting counterpart to the patrioteers. But the art which they thought to achieve by remaining where conditions seemed favourable is seen, from this distance in time, to be blowing down the wind to the oblivion of all rootless things.

Others of that generation, and perhaps the larger number, moved by many different motives, decided to return. This decision was at once natural and admirable; but the results of it proved to be strangely mixed. For the United States in which industrialism reached its apogee was the most difficult of places in which to practise what soon came to be called art for art's sake.

Actually it was technic for technic's sake. And since it was a technic still being practised abroad by the very men from whom the american painters learned it, the american buyers of pictures for a time preferred european originals to native imitations. In this preference the patrons were partly right but mostly wrong. They were right in believing that the technical average of american work was not yet as high as that of the continent; they were wrong about the few individuals who were already capable of equalling their teachers. They were more deeply wrong in thinking that the fashionable portraiture and elaborate still-life and gigantic genre fostered by the academies and salons of contemporaneous Europe had any value whatever except a temporary commercial one. Despite the convincing salestalk of those who participated in this branch of nineteenth-century manufacturing, its

meticulous prosaicism and dazzling virtuosity did not embody the great creative tradition of painting.

Once again american painters had brought back from Europe a technic, but this time the technic came trailing clouds of philosophy from the studios which were its home. Although the philosophy has turned out to be wrong—or at least unworkable—no one who can form any conception of the spiritual disarray of the America which this generation of students left and the spiritual stodginess of the Europe they went to can possibly censure them for their adoption of it. And as for the technic, it is easy just now to underestimate both its degree of improvement over that which preceded it and the difficulty of making it prevail, because the present age has found it unadaptable to a different mentality.

It is true that technic always exists at the mercy of expanding experience, but it is better that a strong body of technic should be in existence ready for modification or even for supersession than that the new experience be compelled to find its embodiment from a base of technical ignorance or incapacity. The impediments encountered by the early landscapists and by Ryder are alone quite enough of this sort of thing to occur in our artistic history.

The technic brought back by the men of '77 was, then, in every way a gain for America, but for them as painters in this particular country it often proved a limitation. When they turned, as some of them did almost at once, to rendering american scenes and people, the resulting pictures were completely european. In this way the exhibition-walls became covered with the Gèrôme-amerind, the Vermeer-New-England-interior, the Hals-costumery, the Raffaelli-New-York-street, the Millet-woodcutter. The trouble lay deeper than technic, of course, in the incapacity for fresh experience; but

in such cases the technic, elevated to the position of aesthetic supremacy, predetermined the vision.

Twachtman, in the poetry of landscape, and Redfield, in its prose, managed to achieve a consistency and continuity of conceptive quality which enables their work to stand up as interpretive wholes. Alden Weir and Thayer sporadically rose to a natively accented significance. But the majority of the home-returned went straight into their studios and began their lifelong repetitions of the lessons of their masters. Whether they acted wisely or not depends upon the person who passes judgment; and whether they were conscious of it or not, their reason was that their craft, if it were subjected to the strain of holding the vulgar vitality of the life outside the studios, would crack. This generation of european students had come nearest of all to bringing over, promptly and adequately, all that a contemporaneous Europe had to teach; but as the gap in time was closed, there was disclosed the more important gap of spiritual change.

The group which made the first effective irruption into the life outside the studios were those whose technic, while radically different from that of the ruling academics, was quite as obviously practised in the studios. But their courage was to relegate technic to second place and indulge an unashamed relish for subject. The scenes happened to be mostly of New York, but their total effect is that of an important and hitherto unrecognized aspect of life in the american city. It was an art of helter-skelter dramatics, of delighted discovery of the paintableness and the enjoyableness of ugliness; and all this was fittingly expressed in a technic of dash and improvisation.

Neither that particular technic nor that particular attack upon life could fulfil the needs of minds more completely aware of a far

more complex world in the making. This world went through a process of disruption and the world of art shared in—even anticipated—that process. In the midst of it, it appeared anarchic enough, and american participation in it also seemed to be “an explosion in a shingle factory.” There were those who liked it and those who didn’t. But one result already partly attained which was foreseen only by the clearer-headed is the reconstitution of the order of art on a wider basis of knowledge and with a higher reach of aspiration.

Far from overthrowing tradition, post-impressionism overthrew only the counterfeit tradition of the academies. The movement as a whole was a return to the living sources of tradition and a reestablishment of contact with the entire vital past. With this has developed among the artists an increasing participation in the present, and among the public an unprecedentedly extensive democratic interest in the whole of art.

The history of painting in America is mainly a record of successive importations of painting technics from Europe. In every instance, from colonial formularizing to cubistic patternizing, it has involved some addition to our own professional resources and popular culture. All of it has been part of a general spiritual agriculture, making a new world fit for human habitation.

The history of american painting is a discovery of what, in all the production of that art, has flowered into a picturing of our own experience and mentality.

It is not necessary to claim that this american painting is better than any other painting. Whether it is even as good as this or that other painting done elsewhere in time or place is, just now, less important than the fact that it can be separated from all other painting for its specific expressiveness. Becoming aware of it is one way

of making a home for ourselves in the universe and in that act becoming a mature and coherent people.

American painting will always be the crest on the wave of painting in America, and for the mind's eye significance lies in the crest. There breaks out the revelation of us to ourselves.

SUPPLEMENT

NOTE

THE purpose of the following lists is to supply a chronological classification of american painters in accordance with the discussion in the text, and more especially to place in that chronology a number of other painters to whom that discussion applies but whose inclusion therein would render it unwieldy.

Nevertheless, these lists are by no means all-inclusive; and selecting them from a much larger array of names has often required decisions based on considerations impossible to mention in an essay as brief as this. Omitted from the earlier sections are all who remain mere names, having too little work authoritatively associated with them to afford a basis for criticism; on the other hand, even where only one or two pictures exist, their painter is included here provided the attributions are convincing. Thus the outline given for the years before 1800 may be taken as an index to the present state of dependable historical knowledge; but each successive period becomes increasingly selective in its groupings so as to prevent unwieldiness in this supplement.

For this reason, also, no attempt is made to give the titles of various anonymous works as they occur; but it cannot be too strongly emphasized that, from the beginnings until after 1850, many anonymous paintings are as important, both historically and aesthetically, as most of those whose authorship is certain.

Where the dates of birth and death are lacking, the painter's years of known activity are given. A date of coming to this country indicates that the painter was born abroad but his work thereafter constitutes a contribution to american history; a date of returning indicates that up to then a nativeborn painter had worked abroad

for a time longer than the customary years of pupilage; a date of leaving indicates that thereafter the painter worked somewhere else. Painters born here who, without having contributed anything notable to american art before leaving, later became submerged in foreign schools—such as Mather Brown among the colonials and many more since american life began to offend those of delicate tastes—are omitted.

For the broad divisions into periods Samuel Isham's three adjectives have been retained as satisfactorily characterizing the mass of work in each one. The striking developments since Isham's time are here covered by a fourth adjective which remains neutral in its connotations, since any characterization of a period still incomplete is best left to posterity; but perhaps the tentative groupings under it may prove temporarily useful.

It is with this present and the nearer past that the personal element inevitably plays an important even if silent part in the making of lists like these. The effort here has been to be both catholic and balanced in the seeming narrowness of choice; but—other tastes, other lists.

V. B.

THE COLONIAL PERIOD: 1607/20-c. 1790

THE BEGINNINGS: 1607/20-c. 1725

New England

W. R. (? William Read: 1607-1679)

To this country 1635

Jeremiah Dummer: 1645-1718

Thomas Child: c. 1655-1706

To this country c. 1688

New Netherland

Evert Duijkinck, 1st: 1621-1702

To this country 1638

Gerret Duijkinck: 1660-1710

Evert Duijkinck, 3d: 1677-1727

Gerardus Duijkinck: 1695-1742

Jacobus Gerritsen Strijcker: ?-1687

To this country 1651

Henri Cousturier: ?-1684

To this country c. 1660

The South

Henrietta Johnston: ?-1728

To this country c. 1755

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PORTRAITURE:

c. 1725-c. 1775

New England

Peter Pelham: c. 1684-1751

To this country 1726

John Smibert: 1688-1751

To this country 1729

Nathaniel Smibert: 1734-1756

Nathaniel Emmons: 1704-1740

Robert Feke: c. 1705-c. 1750

Joseph Badger: 1708-1765

Joseph Blackburn: fl. 1742-1762

To this country c. 1742

John Greenwood: 1727-1792

Left this country 1751

John Singleton Copley: 1737-1815

Left this country 1774.

The Middle Colonies

Pieter Vanderlyn: 1687-1778

John Watson: 1685-1768

To this country 1715

Gustavus Hesselius: 1682-1755

To this country 1711

John Hesselius: 1728-1778

James Clappoole: 1720-c. 1796

Benjamin West: 1738-1820

Left this country 1760

The South

Charles Bridges: fl. c. 1730-c. 1750

To this country c. 1730

John Wollaston: fl. c. 1750-c. 1767

To this country c. 1750

Jeremiah Theüs: c. 1719-1774

To this country 1739

PAINTERS OF THE TRANSITION:

c. 1775-c. 1790

New England

Winthrop Chandler: 1747-1790

Benjamin Blyth: 1740-after 1781

Samuel King: 1749-1819

Ralph Earl: 1751-1801

Returned to this country c. 1786

John Johnston: 1752-1818

The Middle States

Abraham Delanoy: *c.* 1740-1785

Matthew Pratt: 1734-1805

Charles Willson Peale: 1741-1827

Joseph Wright: 1756-1793

Returned to this country 1783

Robert Edge Pine: 1730-1788

To this country 1783

The South

John Durand: *fl.* 1770-1782

Henry Benbridge: 1744-1812

THE PROVINCIAL PERIOD: *c.* 1790-*c.* 1876

PORTRAITISTS IN THE ENGLISH MANNER

Gilbert Stuart: 1755-1828
 Returned to this country 1793
 Edward Savage: 1761-1817
 Jacob Eichholtz: 1776-1842
 John Wesley Jarvis: 1780-1839
 To this country 1785
 Samuel Waldo: 1783-1861
 William Jewett: 1795-1874
 Bass Otis: 1784-1861
 Charles Bird King: 1785-1862
 James Frothingham: 1786-1864
 Matthew Harris Jouett: 1787-1827
 John Neagle: 1796-1865
 Thomas Sully: 1783-1872
 To this country 1792

MINIATURE PAINTERS

[Certain men included in other sections of these lists also produced notable miniatures—in the foregoing sections: Copley, C. W. Peale, Benbridge, Stuart, Jarvis, Sully; in succeeding sections: Trumbull (working in oil) and Inman]
 Joseph Dunkerley: *fl.* 1784-1787
 Edward Greene Malbone: 1777-1807
 Henry Williams: 1787-1830
 Sarah Goodridge: 1788-1853
 James Sharples: 1752-1811
 To this country 1796
 John Ramage: 1763-1802
 In this country from *c.* 1775 to 1794
 Robert Field: *c.* 1770-1819
 In this country from 1794 to 1806
 Archibald Robertson: 1765-1835
 To this country 1791

Benjamin Trott: *c.* 1770-after 1841
 Anson Dickinson: 1779-1852
 Joseph Wood: *c.* 1778-*c.* 1832
 Ann Hall: 1792-1863
 Thomas Seir Cummings: 1804-1894
 To this country in infancy
 Richard Morrell Staigg: 1817-1881
 To this country 1831
 James Peale: 1749-1831
 Raphaelle Peale: 1774-1825
 Anna Claypoole Peale: 1791-1878
 Charles Fraser: 1782-1860

PORTRAITISTS OF FRENCH TRAINING

C. B. J. F. de Saint-Memin: 1770-1852
 In this country from 1794 to 1815
 John Vanderlyn: 1776-1852
 Returned to this country 1815
 Rembrandt Peale: 1778-1860
 Samuel Finley Breese Morse: 1791-1872
 Returned to this country 1815
 John James Audubon: 1785-1851
 To this country 1798

HISTORICAL PAINTERS

John Trumbull: 1756-1843
 William Dunlap: 1766-1839
 Washington Allston: 1779-1843
 Returned to this country 1818
 William M. Page: 1811-1885
 Emanuel Leutze: 1816-1868
 To this country in childhood
 Daniel Huntington: 1816-1906
 Henry Peters Gray: 1819-1877

FOLK PAINTING

[Much the greater part of this work, including many of the best examples, remains anonymous; but the following individuals achieved things of interest and merit]

Portraiture

James Sandford Ellsworth
(Western Connecticut)
Erastus Salisbury Field
(Western Massachusetts)
William Bartol
(Eastern Massachusetts)
Nathan Negus
(Massachusetts and Alabama)
J. Atwood
(Western Massachusetts)
Benjamin Greenleaf
(New England)

Landscape and Genre

L. Whitney
C. H. Fischer
(Newark, New Jersey)
Joseph Pickett
(New Hope, Pennsylvania)
Edward Hicks
(Bucks County, Pennsylvania)
George Ropes
(Salem, Massachusetts)
Mary Ann Bacon
(Litchfield, Connecticut)
James Eights
(Albany, New York)
Thomas Ruckle
(Baltimore, Maryland)

Marine

James Bard
A. Stanwood

Decoration

Sylvester Hall
(Connecticut)
Michele Felice Corn : c. 1765-1845
(New England)
To this country 1799
R. Porter
(Massachusetts)
E. J. Gilbert
(Maine)
Boutwell
(Groton, Massachusetts)

PAINTERS OF GENRE

[Notable work in genre was also accomplished in this country by Inman, Eastman Johnson, Homer, and Eakins; and later in Europe by expatriates too numerous to mention]

John Lewis Krimmel: 1787-1821
To this country 1810
Henry Sargent: 1776-1845
William Sidney Mount: 1807-1868
Tompkins H. Matteson: 1813-1884
Thomas Waterman Wood: 1823-1903
Richard Caton Woodville: 1825-1855
William H. Beard: 1825-1900
John George Brown: 1831-1913
To this country 1853
Thomas Hovenden: 1840-1895
To this country 1863
Edward Lamson Henry: 1841-1919

MIDCENTURY PORTRAITISTS

Chester Harding: 1792-1866
Charles Cromwell Ingham: 1796-1863
 To this country 1816
Henry Inman: 1801-1846
Charles Loring Elliott: 1812-1868
Eastman Johnson: 1824-1906

EARLY LANDSCAPISTS

Thomas Doughty: 1793-1856
Asher Brown Durand: 1796-1886
Thomas Cole: 1801-1848
 To this country 1819

MIDCENTURY LANDSCAPISTS

[The following landscape painters (sometimes including the three foregoing) are often termed "The Hudson River School"; but there seems to be no real reason for confining them to that locality when so much of their work was done in other regions]

John W. Casilear: 1811-1893
John Frederick Kensett: 1818-1872
Worthington Whittredge: 1820-1910
Jasper F. Cropsey: 1823-1900
Jervis McEntee: 1828-1891
David Johnson: 1827-1908
James McDougall Hart: 1828-1901
 To this country 1831

Robert Swain Gifford: 1840-1905

[The four following painters belong together in their preference for working on a panoramic scale]

Frederick Edwin Church: 1826-1900
Thomas Hill: 1829-1913
Albert Bierstadt: 1830-1902
 To this country 1831

Thomas Moran: 1837-1926
 To this country 1844

[The three following painters achieved work of greater technical competence and aesthetic worth than any of the foregoing]

George Inness: 1825-1894
Homer Dodge Martin: 1836-1897
Alexander Helwig Wyant: 1836-1892

INDIVIDUALISTS

George Fuller: 1822-1884
William Morris Hunt: 1824-1879
 Returned to this country 1855
Robert Loftin Newman: 1827-1912
James McNeill Whistler: 1834-1903
 Left this country 1855
John La Farge: 1835-1910
Elihu Vedder: 1836-1923
 Left this country 1856
Winslow Homer: 1836-1910
Thomas Eakins: 1844-1916
Albert Pinkham Ryder: 1847-1917

THE COSMOPOLITAN PERIOD: c. 1876-c. 1913

PORTRAITISTS

Frederick P. Vinton: 1846-1911
Frank Duveneck: 1848-1919
Returned to this country 1888
William Merritt Chase: 1849-1916
John Singer Sargent: 1856-1925
Born and lived abroad
Cecilia Beaux: 1863-
Charles Hopkinson: 1869-
Leopold Seyffert: 1888-

FIGURE PAINTERS

Abbott Henderson Thayer: 1849-1921
Thomas Wilmer Dewing: 1851-
Julian Alden Weir: 1852-1919
Emil Carlsen: 1853-
To this country 1872
Mary Cassatt: 1855-1926
Left this country 1869
George DeForest Brush: 1855-
John White Alexander: 1856-1915
Returned to this country 1901
Gari Melchers: 1860-
Maurice Brazil Prendergast: 1861-1924
Arthur B. Davies: 1862-1928
Bryson Burroughs: 1869-
Kenneth Hayes Miller: 1876-

THE BOSTON GROUP

Joseph Rodifer DeCamp: 1858-1923
Frank Weston Benson: 1862-
Edmund C. Tarbell: 1862-
William McGregor Paxton: 1869-

THE NEW YORK GROUP

Robert Henri: 1865-1929
George Luks: 1867-
William J. Glackens: 1870-
John Sloan: 1871-
George Wesley Bellows: 1882-1925
Guy Pène DuBois: 1884-

PAINTERS OF WESTERN LIFE

Frederick Remington: 1861-1909
Ernest Leonard Blumenschein: 1874-
Walter Ufer: 1876-
Victor Higgins: 1884-

MURAL PAINTERS

[Work in this form was done also by
Sargent, Alexander, Thayer, Reid, Mel-
chers, and Davies]
Edwin Howland Blashfield: 1848-
Edwin Austen Abbey: 1852-1911
Left this country 1878
Will Hicok Low: 1853-
Kenyon Cox: 1856-1919
H. Siddons Mowbray: 1858-1928
To this country 1885
Maxfield Parrish: 1870-
Fred Dana Marsh: 1872-
Robert Winthrop Chanler: 1872-1930
Violet Oakley: 1874-
Boardman Robinson: 1876-
Augustus Vincent Tack: 1870-

Barry Faulkner: 1881-
Ezra Winter: 1886-
Eugene Francis Savage: 1883-

STUDIO TONALISM

Ralph Albert Blakelock: 1847-1919
Dwight William Tryon: 1849-1925
Ben Foster: 1852-1926
J. Francis Murphy: 1853-1921
Charles Harold Davis: 1856-
Bruce Crane: 1857-
Henry Ward Ranger: 1858-1916
Horatio Walker: 1858-
Elliott Daingerfield: 1859-

LUMINISM IN LANDSCAPE

[Notable work in this form was done
also by Thayer, Weir, Chase, and Sar-
gent]

Theodore Robinson: 1852-1896

Returned to this country 1888

John Henry Twachtman: 1853-1902

William Leroy Metcalf: 1858-1925

Childe Hassam: 1859-

Allen Tucker: 1866-

Edward Willis Redfield: 1868-

Ernest Lawson: 1873-

Daniel Garber: 1879-

Gifford Beal: 1879-

Robert Spencer: 1879-1930

John Fulton Folinsbee: 1892-

THE CONTEMPORARY PERIOD: c. 1913 to date

[In the work of the following painters the dominant quality is introspection]

Vincent Canadé
Arthur Garfield Dove
Marsden Hartley
Yasuo Kuniyoshi
Henry Mattson
Alfred Maurer
Max Weber

[In the work of the following painters the quality of introspection takes on a definitely lyrical character]

Emil Branchard
Charles Demuth
Leon Hartl
Bernard Karfiol
Julia Kelly
Carl Knaths
Georgia O'Keeffe
Joseph Stella
Abram Walkowitz

[In the work of the following painters the quality of lyricism is developed into an overt romanticism]

Thomas H. Benton
Charles Burchfield
Glenn Coleman
Rockwell Kent
John Marin
Joseph Pollet

[In the work of the following painters the quality of romanticism assumes a neoclassic dress]

Henry Billings
Edward Bruce
Peter Blume
Andrew Dasburg
Stuart Davis
Preston Dickinson
Elsie Driggs
Stefan Hirsch
Morris Kantor
Charles Sheeler
Maurice Sterne

[In the work of the following painters there is a comprehensiveness of intention which eludes the single characterizing word]

Arnold Blanch
Alexander Brook
Ernest Fiene
Edward Hopper
Leon Kroll
Reginald Marsh
Henry Lee McFee
Charles Rosen
Katharine Schmidt
Henry Schnakenberg
Eugene Speicher

01587

